



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Brevity is the keynote of the whole work. All the rules are stated in a concise and clear manner. But this has led the author into the defect of sacrificing thorough analysis for the sake of brevity. This is especially noticeable in the treatment of "Dependent Relative Revocation", at page 97. In connection with the treatment of this subject, another omission by the author is brought forth, *i. e.*, his failure to cite the articles on the various subjects which appear from time to time in the leading legal reviews. No present-day work, be it a text- or case-book, can be considered up to standard if it fails to digest and annotate these leading articles. For example, in connection with the subject of "Dependent Relative Revocation", Professor Owen J. Roberts has written a splendid article in 49 U. OF PA. L. R. 18 (1901). Many other similar instances could be pointed out, but this will suffice to illustrate.

In spite of these objections the work on the whole will be a serviceable tool for the Western lawyer.

D. D. S.

RECOLLECTIONS OF BENCH AND BAR. By the Right Hon. Viscount Alverstone, G. C. M. G. Pp. xi and 331. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1915.

It is pleasant for us on this side of the Atlantic to read of the experiences of one who has had a career of eminent success in the English court. In these "Recollections", Lord Alverstone tells of himself, simply and candidly, not in the manner of one who boasts of his achievements, but in the manner of one who feels that his interesting experiences should not remain locked in his memory alone.

Lord Alverstone was born in 1842, and received his education at Trinity College, Cambridge. Upon graduation he read law, being called to the bar in 1868. Ten years later he "took silk"—that is, became a "Queen's Counsel". In 1890, he was made Attorney General, in which office he continued until 1900, when he became Lord Chief Justice of England. He retired from the bench in 1913, because of ill-health. So much for the bare facts of the author's life; but the interest of the book does not lie in them alone. All through the book Lord Alverstone describes the many amusing incidents of his life and relates anecdotes about himself and the men with whom he was associated. He devotes chapters to telling of the more particular branches of his work such as "Patent Cases", "House of Lords and Privy Council", and "International Arbitrations". In another chapter he describes his impressions of the various prominent men whom he has met. One of the most humanizing elements of the book is the chapter which deals with the author's two "hobbies": athletics and music. It is of interest to note that Lord Alverstone was a famous distance runner and one of the founders of the Cambridge University Athletic Association.

The attention of the American lawyer is called to that portion of the book in which the author tells why he is convinced of the propriety of the division of the English bar into barristers and solicitors. One person, he says, who both works up the brief and argues the case without realizing it gives undue prominence to certain points of the case which particularly impress him, whether they are really important or not; however one who argues a case the brief of which he has seen at most for only a few days, looks upon the matter with a clearer perspective and is much more apt to lay stress upon the points which really are important.

On the whole, the book should prove of interest to the lawyers of this country and perhaps of benefit to them, for the book offers a means of comparing the life of the English lawyer with that of the American lawyer, and they may find that their lives may be improved by the adoption of some of the habits of the lawyers on the other side of the Atlantic.

E. W. M.